Previous references.

1908 89
(Sep. Revs)

File No. 107—08

Serial Nos. 1—2

Later references.

S.R. 54-10. 881-2.
SR 211-10.
SR 211-10 Sch 1-5 Boehr
SR 168-11 Sch 1-2 B June 13
S.R 116-15 SS 182, B. May 1916.

24 P

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—2

Part B. for February 1909

SUBJECT.

Recognising the Inamdar's claim to the Excise revenue from toddy of the Sirvamanya Bagali, Jabigunnur, Devahalli villages in the Chanagiri Taluk & the Sirvamanya Hoskette village in the Honnali Taluk

1) From the Excise Comm^r No. 4933 & 23/11/08 submits the records of enquiry & states that the Inamdar is entitled to the revenue from toddy

2) Do the Excise Comm^r, employing, Inam Supdt. No. H 3771-39 23/1/09 Recognises the claim.

G.R.S. 11]

1908.9

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(S.R)

NOTES.

File No. 107-08

FILE HEADING.

Inamdar's claim to the Sheist revenue from toddy of Baggli + 3 other villages.

From

The Sheist Court

No. 4933 Dated 23.11.08 Received 23.11.08

Diary No. 1750 Enclos. 4 Spare Copies Serial No. 1.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Submits the records of inquiry + thinks that the Inamdar is entitled to the Sheist revenue from toddy of all the four villages.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

This case is somewhat complex + confuses of the Inamdar's desire is claim to the Sheist revenue from toddy of Baggli, Jamur + Devanahalli in the Chamarajanagar Tk + Hoskote in the Nanjangud Tk.

NOTES—First sheet

GPB—30,000—3-4-07.

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S. R File No. 107 of 1908

Serial No.	
	The case of the last village, Horakole in the Nanjangud Taluk, is simple and may be taken first. It was granted in
X 4.	1829 by H. H. the late Maharaja to Chikk Deva Raja, grandfather of Lt. Col: Devaraja Urs, the present Inamdar, under a Sanad in which 'Echalpaini' is mentioned as having been conceded. It contains the
	being (estimated income) account of the village at the time of alienation & shows 4 pagodas against "Sendi". And Sendi
M 4.	was one of the items of revenue enjoyed by the Inamdar at the time of the Inam Settlement. There has always been a Sendi shop & a date grove in the village. The Inam Settlement have recognized the Inamdar title to "Sendi" the Investigating Officer the Collector as also the Excise Comr. allow the claim which may therefore be recognized.
	Owning to the case of the other 3 villages Bagali, Jamur & Devichalli, it has to be pointed out that it is not known when they were first granted to the family in question. All that we know of them is that they were resumed under a general order issued by H. H. the late Maharaja but restored in 1818 on Kaifiyat to Timma
X 1	

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—13-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S R File No. 107 of 1908

Serial No.	
	under a Sanad which conceded Sendi in specific terms in the case of all these three villages. It is also known that the Kaigamputta tenure of these villages was an application from Chik Deva Rao converted into Sawaramy in the case of Baggli, and into Jodi in the case of the other two in two separate
x_2	Sanads dated respectively the 23.9.1824
x_3	and 9.9.1826. But the wordings of these Sanads are not alike. Whilst those in the case of Baggli being full and clear, conceding as it does Sehalpain to the Inamdar, those relating to the other two
x_2	villages merely change the tenure without
x_3	reiterating, as in the case of Baggli, the items of revenue alienated by the first Sanad. In the case of all, Sendi was
m_1 to m_3	being enjoyed at the time of the Inam Settlement + toddy" was mentioned in the Inam title deed. But the remarks of the Inam Settlement are not the same.
m_1	In the case of Baggli, the remarks = Rights to Sayer + toddy are conceded as per Sanad ... All other rights to Sirkar are reserved", whilst in the case of the other
m_2 & m_3	two the remarks = the item of toddy is

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—13-5-08

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S. R File No. 107 of 1908

Serial No.

Enjoyed is now conceded as far as conveying the right to rent the lands to the fort. Contractor. The rights ... the remaining items of akkair ... are reserved".

Whether these remarks mean the same thing as discussed by the Sheristadar, or mean different things as understood by the investigating officer, the fact is clear that the Inam Settlement Officer had not before him the original Sanad of 1818. It is unfortunate that the Inamdar did not have produced before that officer only the subsequent Sanad of 1826 which merely changes the terms. In the case of Bagali, the investigating officer allows the claim, & all other officers support it.

2.

The case of the other two villages presents some difficulty. Though the one is on all fours with the other, the investigating officer allows the claim in the case of Damalalli & disallows it in the case of Jamur. This is apparently because he read the Bagali Inam Ref^e instead of Jamur Inam Ref^e in disposing of Damalalli.

As shown above, the claim of the Inamdar to the Sheristadar revenue of Jamur & Damalalli

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50.000—13-5-08

Serial No.

cannot be supported merely by the Inam Settlement, which is no doubt defective by reason of the fact that, first, it has not before it the original Sanads of 1818, and secondly, its language is ambiguous.

But the other features of the case lend full support to the claim. On the original Sanads of 1818 and on the strength of uninterrupted enjoyment (for which there is no record clear proof for the years 1870 to 1892), the claim as it is submitted, is sustainable.

In the foregoing circumstances, the opinion of the Engineer Board that the Inamdar, Lt. Col: Devaraja Urs, is entitled to the Sheist revenue from taxes of all the four villages may be accepted.

The subjoined table shows the merits of the case in regard to the four villages in question.

Nos. 1 to 5 — This is not a case of [illegible] relief the alienation by Sanad to not established

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S. R File No. 107 of 1908-9

6

Serial No.				
Name of village	Baggli.	Jamur	Semahalli.	Hosakote.
Is Sendi conceded by Sanad?	yes. in 1818 also in 1824.	yes in 1818 The Sanad of 1826 does not relinquish the items already included under the original Sanads but merely changes terms.	yes in 1818	yes in 1829
Was it enjoyed at the time of Inam Settlement?	yes. Sendi	yes Sendi	yes Sendi	yes. Sendi
Is Sendi or toddy conceded at the Inam Settlement?	yes. ~~Sendi~~ toddy.	yes toddy	yes toddy	yes sendi
Period of enjoyment proved.	1870-92	1820-92	1820-92	1870-92.
Is there a toddy shop or a grove?	Both	Both	Grove only	Shop only.
Is the investigating officer in favour of it?	yes.	No (mistaken view)	yes (mistaken view)	yes.
Is the Inam Board in favour?	yes	yes	yes	yes.

Submitted.
K. S.
7/12/08.

-Contn. sheet.

Note- Contn sheet.

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S. R. File No. 10 of 1908-9

Serial No.	
8	The Excise Commr. has discussed the
	case fully and his view of it
1	appears to be correct. Please
	put up a draft accepting his
	recommendation & recognising
	the claim in respect of all the
	four villages.
	mnle
	19-12-8.
	Submitted with a draft accordingly recog-
	-nising the claim.
	K.S.
	29/12/08.
	30/12
	Please issue a
	fresh draft put up
	for Commission
	mnle
	31-12-8
1931 6	The Draft may be approved
4-1-09	when the bills for refund are
	received the amounts would
	require careful scrutiny so that
	the Inamdar may have all his
	just dues & only them & no more.
	Mtt 7 Jany 09
	Dewan
	Vtd 7 Jan. 09 SB
11516	Draft approved
8/1/09	Issue
	8/1
	19.2.09 SB 18/2/09

NOTE—Contn. sheet

GPB—50.000—18-5-08

Serial No. 2

To the Sn. Bord, Comptr: & Audit Dept:-

No: R. 3771-3 dated 23.2.09.

Accepts the Sniene Bord's opinion that the Inaandar is subject to the Sniene Rev: for toddy & ale the four villages.

Office of the Excise Commissioner
in Mysore,
Bangalore dated 6th November 1908.

From

H.H. Sparkes Esquire,
Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

To

K.S. Chendrasekhara Aiyer Esquire, B.A.,B.L.,
Secretary to the Government of His
Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General & Revenue Departments.

Sir,

I have the honor to submit herewith the records of enquiry relating to the Inamdar's claim to the Excise revenue from toddy of Sarvamanya Bagali, Jodi Jannur and Demahalli villages in the Chamarajnagar Taluk and Sarvamanya Hoskote village in the Najangud Taluk together with the correspondence ending with the Mysore Deputy Commissioner's docket No.160, dated 4th September 1908 and to state that the Deputy Commissioner and the investigating officer while recognizing the claims of the Inamdar in respect of Sarvamanya Bagali, Jodi Demahalli and Sarvamanya Hoskote villages, disallow the claim in respect of Jodi Jannur on the ground that no mention of the toddy item is made in its Sannad and that the Inamdar's right is restricted in the extract of the Inam Enquiry register, only to rent the trees to Government contractors.

2. Before Mr. S. Vaidyanatha Aiyer, the Nanjangud Sub Division officer, the following Sannads, authenticated copies of which are filed in the records, were produced:-

1. Original deed of gift from His highness the late Maharaja Sri Krishnaraja Wadayar Bahadur III, dated 10th March 1829 gifting the village of Hoskote assessed at 728-2-13 P. F. Minor Jari Inams 3-4-0 to Chick Desi Urs. The details of the beriz account of the village are given in the Sannad

2

Sannad and 4 Pagodas are shown as the income from "sendi"; besides "Eachalpairu" is mentioned as having been conceded to the Inamdar.

2. Sannad dated 23rd September 1824 granting the village of Bagali to Chiranjeevi Chicka Desi Urs assessed at 1024-8-P. F. including Jari Inamathi of 2 Pagodas, for household expenditure. The details of the Beriz account of the villag are not given but "Eachalpairu" is conceded to the Inamdar.

3. Original Nirup dated 9th September 1826 to Appo Row, Amildar of the Chamarajnagar Taluk, intimating the grant of the villages of Jannur and Demahalli which were till then enjoyed as Kayamgutha, by Chick Desi Urs, on a Jodi of 700 Pagodas, to the said Urs. In this Nirup the detail of the beriz are not given and no mention of either "sendi" or "Eachalpairu" is made.

4. Original Sannad dated 16th June 1818 ordering the release from attachment of the Kayamgutha villages of Bagali, Jennur and Demahalli and directing the continuance of the said villages on Kayamgutha tenure the gutha amount including "sendi" and other items being 2409 and odd Pagodas. This Sannad reveals the whole history of the case The three villages of Bagali, Jennur and Demahalli were first given over to Chick Desi Urs on Kayamgutha tenure. Subsequently they were attached and finally restored under the above said Nirup on the same tenure. By the Sannad dated 23rd September 1824 Bagali was granted as a Sarvamanyam and the Nirup dated 9th September 1826 converted the Kayamgutha tenure of Jennur and Demahalli villages into a Jodi tenure. The beriz account of the three villages given in the Sannad of 1818 tallies with those given in the two subsequent Sannads. "Sendi" having been included in the gutha amount fixed by the Sannad of 1818, the non-mention of the same in the subsequent Sannad

Sannad converting the tenure of the two villages of Jemur and Demahalli into Jodi, cannot be construed to mean that "sendi" was not conceded in the Sannad in the case of the two villages. The beriz account given in all the Sannads being the same, it is clear that "sendi" has been conceded in the instrument of alienation in the case of all the 3 villages. The second Sannad relating to Jennur and Demahalli concerned itself with the only question of the conversion of the tenure and there was no necessity in that Sannad to reiterate the items already conceded in the first Sannad. The invetsigating officer has failed to study the Sannad of 1818 and his remarks that no mention of toddy item is made in the Sannad of the other two villages Jennur and Demahalli are not quite accurate.

3. At the Inam Settlement of the Hoskote village conducted in the year 1880 the Inam Superintendent has recorded "confirmed free on the Umbli tenure". But the Inam Assistant Mr. B. Rajagopaliah has stated that the items of Sayer and sendi are enjoyed by the parties as per Sannad. "Sendi" is further mentioned under items enjoyed. In the case of Bagali village rights to Sayer and toddy are conceded at the Inam Settlement conducted in the year 1879. The Inam Assistant Mr. B. Rajagopaliah has recorded in column 19 of the Inam register of enquiry of the village of Jennur as follows:- " The Nirup does not convey authority to the enjoyment of Sayer, sendi and forests. But from the Dassala Huttuvali statement filed by the Curator sendi is enjoyed by the parties the amount varying from R$ 291-12-8 to R$ 612-15-4 &c. Under items enjoyed "sendi" is mentioned. In col. 20 the Inam Superintendent has recorded under date 1880 that the item of toddy is enjoyed and is now conceded as far as conveying the right to rent the trees to the Government contractor. Here it must be remarked that the Sannad of 1818 does not appear to have been produced at the Inam Settlement. Had it been produced it would have clearly shown that "sendi" was conceded by the

the Sannad. From what the Inam Assistant has recorded and the decision of the Inam Superintendent which is based on the remarks of his Assistant, it is clear that toddy has been conceded at the Inam Settlement. The limitation can in this case only mean that the Inamdar cannot of his own accord tap toddy and sell the same but should do so through the Government contractor. The distinction between the rent of date trees and the Excise revenue from toddy cannot be expected to have been contemplated at the time of the Inam settlement, and besides the former is an item included in the tenure itself and does not reuqire a fresh mention. It will further be seen that the Inamdar has been in the uninterrupted enjoyment of nothing short of the Excise revenue from toddy of this village for a long period both prior and subsequent to the Inam Settlement. In the case of Demahalli village the Inam Assistant Mr. B. Rajagopaliah has recorded that the revenue derived from "sendi" in this village is from R$ 43-4-10 to R$ 91-0-6. "Sendi" is further mentioned under items enjoyed. The Inam Superintendent has referred to the Asali case of Jennur for orders on all other points. The remarks made in the case of the latter village apply to Demahalli also. Here again the investigating officer Mr. H. Seetharamiah has committed a mistake. In para 5 of his letter he says that at the Inam Settlement "sendi" is conceded for Demahalli village but as regards Jennur toddy is conceded as far as conveying the right to rent the trees to the Government contractors and the Inamdar's right to remaining items of Abkari are reserved. This betrays his imperfect study of the Inam registers of Enquiry of the villages. In the case of Demahalli the remarks of the Inam Superintendent have not been read. The Deputy Commissioner's opinion recorded on the Calendar is based on the investigating officer's letter.

4. In proof of enjoyment of the Excise revneu from toddy of the four villages the Inamdar has produced and filed true extract from his khange accounts. In these accounts is mentioned the revenue derived from each of the villages on account of the Excise revenue

5

revenue from toddy during the years 1870 to 1887. The copies of decrees in Miscellaneous cases Nos.21 and 8 of 1891-92 in case No.3 of 1892-93 produced by the Inamdar fully establish the Inamdar's enjoyment of Excise revenue from toddy of all the four villages from 1887 to the end of 1892.

5. As the right to the Excise revenue from toddy of all the four villages has been conceded in the Sannad and recognized at the Inam Settlement and as the Inamdar has produced evidence of having enjoyed the right uninterruptedly for a period of 22 years prior to 1892-93 I am of opinion that he is entitled to the Excise revenue from toddy of all the four villages.

6. In the Hoskote village of the Nanjangud Taluk there is a toddy shop but no date grove. In the Bagali and Jennur villages of the Chamarajanagar Taluk there are both toddy shops and date groves but in Demahalli village there is only a date grove. The case of the first three villages falls under rules 2, 3, 5, 9, 11 and 12 and that of Demahalli under rules 2, 3, 5 and 13 of the rules of the 2nd August 1901.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant

for Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

4

3 copies

6

G.R.S. 28]

Fair Draft. File No. 1708

Serial No. 2.

Diary No. of letter replid to 1750

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.
(S.R)

Date of issue 23rd Dec 1909

Signed by W Bowring

READ.—

Letter No: 4933 dtd 23rd November 1908, from the Sheristadar in Mysore, Submitting the record of inquiry relating to the Inamdar's claim to the Sheist Rev: from lands of the Sawamanya Bagali Jodi Jamur + Dimahalli villages in the Chamaraja-nagar Taluk and the Sawamanya Hosakote village in the Nanjangud

ORDER THEREON.—No.

over

SUBJECT

MGCPB—20,000—24-2-05

Salem.

order thereon: No 76377-3

In the case of the S.R 107-08-2
Kosakde village in the } 23 Feby/09
Kanjicode Salem,
the item of Sendi
has been alienated
by the Sarvad of
1829 and the alienation
has accordingly been
recognized by the Inam
Settlement conducted
in 1880.

The three other villages
of Baggli, Jamur and
Dimahalli were first granted
to Chikk Desi urs on
Kayamgutta tenure and,
though they were subsequently
attached under a general
order, they were restored
in 1818 on the same
Kayamgutta tenure
under a Sanad the

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

gutta account mentioned in which included sendi the Karyamgutta tenure of these villages was converted into one of Sarvamanya in the case of Baggli and into Jodi in the case of Jaunur & Dimahalli under two separate Inams dated respectively the 23.9.1824 and 9.9.1826 and the Beriz account of the three villages given in the Saccad of 1818 tallies with that given in the Saccads of 1824 & 1826. The Saccad of 1824 which converted the tenure of Baggli into one of Sarvamanya mentions "Eachalpairi" as having been conceded to the Inamdar but that of 1826 which altered the Karyamgutta tenure of Jaunur & Dimahalli into Jodi makes no reference to "sendi" or "Eachalpairi"

$x_2 + x_3$

At the Inam Settlement, the right of the

MGCPB—30,000—5-4-05.

Inamdar to the Todday

Meirs Revenue was admitted in the case of the Bagali village. In the case of the Jammur village the Inam Superintendent's decision was that the item of todday is suspended and is cancelled as far as conveying the right to rent the trees to the pat: Canbatas" while in that of Demahalli no decision was recorded on this point. But reference was made to the Bagali case of Jammur for orders on that & other points, not specially mentioned therein.

The Investigating officer has in the above circumstances, admitted the Inamdar's right to the todday Meirasdar of the three villages & Hosahalli Demahalli & Bagali but has disallowed it in regard to the Jammur village and in this finding the Board has concurred. The Meirasdar Board points out that the Investigating officer has

Thiruvalli not consulted the
Samaad of 1818, which clearly
shows that the toddy excise revenue
was alienated from the inclusion
of "Sendi" in the Sirkar amount,
that the non-mention of "Sendi"
~~of Sendi~~" in the Samaad of
1826 does not mean that the
right to "Sendi" was reserved
as that Samaad concerned
itself only with changing
the nature of tenure and
that the Investigating Officer
has not correctly read the
decision at the Inam
Settlement regarding Jaccur
& Demalhalli as he has
admitted the right in regard
of one village & disallowed it in
regard to the other, while the
decision in the case of both is
the same. The same Board
also states that from what
the Inam Asstt. has recorded
and the decision of the Inam
Superintendent which is based
on the remarks of his Asstt.,
it is clear that toddy has
been conceded at the Inam

Settlement. The limitation can in this case only mean that the Inamdar can not of his own accord take away taddy and sell the same but should do so through the Sub: Collector. Sub: Collr in this view has the right to the Sheist Res: from taddy of all the Inam villages has been conceded by competent authority & recognized at the Inam Settlement and as the Inamdar has also produced evidence of having enjoyed the right uninterruptedly for a period of 22 years prior to 1892-3 they are pleased to accept the Sheist Bar's opinion that the Inamdar is entitled to the Sheist Res. from taddy of all the Inam villages.

The Hosakote village contains only a taddy shop but no date grove. In Bagli & Jamur, there are both taddy shops & date groves. In Dimahalli, there is only a date grove. The case of the first 3 villages,

G.R.S. 27

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

R

falls under paras 2, 3, 5, 9, 11 & 12 and that of Devanahalli under paras 2, 3, 5 and 13 of the rules appended to G.O. Nos: 2074-83/R-7 166-92 dated 2-8-1901.

Print.

Secretary to Govt.

Mysore 31/12/08 Pl. & Rev: Dept.

to the Excise Supdt with Supdt

" the Conservator to Govt.

" the Accountant Govt

K.S.

29/12/08

31.

While submitting bills for the necessary refunds of Revenue if any, the Excise Commr will be good enough to specify the years in which the shops within Bangalore limits have been sold separately together with the amounts realised by such separate Sales, & also the years in which the Bangalore Rent fees have been levied & kept & the same amounts realised on this head

Secretary

Asst Secretary

MGCPB—30,000—5-4 05.

Copied S.R.

READ—

Letter No. 4933, dated the 23rd November 1908, from the Excise Commissioner, Mysore, submitting the record of enquiry relating to the Inamdar's claim to the Excise Revenue from toddy of the Sarvamanya Bagali, Jodi Jannur and Demahalli villages in the Chamrajnagar Taluk and the Sarvamanya Hoskote village in the Nanjangud Taluk.

FL. 3771-3—S. R. 107-98-2, DATED BANGALORE, 23RD FEBRUARY 1909.

ORDER THEREON.—In the case of the Hoskote village in the Nanjangud Taluk the item of Sendi has been alienated by the Sannad of 1829 and the alienation has accordingly been recognised by the Inam Settlement conducted in 1880.

The three other villages of Bagali, Jannur and Demahalli were first granted to Chik Desi Urs on Kayamgutta tenure and though they were subsequently attached under a general order, they were restored in 1818 on the same Kayamgutta tenure under a Sannad, the gutta amount mentioned in which included "Sendi." The Kayamgutta tenure of these villages was converted into one of Sarvamanya in the case of Bagali and into Jodi in the case of Jannur and Demahalli under two separate Nirups dated respectively the 23rd September 1824 and 9th September 1826 and the beriz account of the three villages given in the Sannad of 1818 tallies with that given in the Sannads of 1824 and 1826. The Sannad of 1824, which converted the tenure of Bagali into one of Sarvamanya mentions "Eachalpairu" as having been conceded to the Inamdar but that of 1826 which altered the Kayamgutta tenure of Jannur and Demahalli into Jodi makes no reference to "Sendi" or "Eachalpairu."

At the Inam Settlement, the right of the Inamdar to the toddy Excise Revenue was admitted in the case of the Bagali village. In the case of the Jannur village the Inam Superintendent's decision was that "the item of toddy is enjoyed and is conceded as far as conveying the right to rent the trees to the Government Contractor," while in that of Demahalli no decision was recorded on this point but reference was made to the Asli case of Jannur for orders on that and other points not specially mentioned therein.

The Investigating Officer has, in the above circumstances, admitted the Inamdar's right to the toddy Excise Revenue of the three villages Hoskote, Demahalli and Bagali, but has disallowed it in regard to the fourth village Jannur and in this finding the Deputy Commissioner has concurred. The Excise Commissioner points out that the Investigating Officer has apparently not consulted the Sannad of 1818, which clearly shows that toddy Excise Revenue was alienated from the inclusion of "Sendi" in the gutta amount, that the non-mention of "Sendi" in the Sannad of 1826 does not mean that the right to "Sendi" was reserved, as that Sannad concerned itself only with changing the nature of tenure, and that the Investigating Officer has not correctly read the decision at the Inam Settlement regarding Jannur and Demahalli as he has admitted the right in respect of one village and disallowed it in regard to the other while the decision in the case of both is the same. The Excise Commissioner also states that "from what the Inam Assistant has recorded and the decision of the Inam Superintendent which is based on the remarks of his Assistant, it is clear that toddy has been conceded at the Inam Settlement. The limitation can in this case only mean that the Inamdar cannot of his own accord tap toddy and sell the same but should do so through the Government Contractor." Government agree in this view and as the right to the Excise Revenue from toddy of all the four villages has been conceded by competent authority and recognised at the Inam Settlement and as the Inamdar has also produced evidence of having enjoyed the right uninterruptedly for a period of twenty two years prior to 1892-93 they are pleased to accept the Excise Commissioner's opinion that the Inamdar is entitled to the Excise Revenue from toddy of all the four villages.

Financial (Separate Revenue), dated 23rd February 1909.

The Hoskote village contains only a toddy shop but no date grove. In Bagali and Jannur there are both toddy shops and date groves. In Demahalli there is only a date grove. The case of the first three villages falls under paras 2, 3, 5, 9, 11 and 12 and that of Demahalli under paras 2, 3, 5 and 13 of the rules appended to Government Order No. 2074-83—R. F. 166-92, dated the 2nd August 1901. While submitting bills for the necessary refunds of revenue, if any, the Excise Commissioner will be good enough to specify the years in which the shops within Inam limits have been sold separately together with the amounts realised by such separate sales and also the years in which the Inamdar's date trees have been tapped for toddy and separate accounts kept of the same together with the amounts realised on this head.

C. S. BALASUNDARAM IYER,
Offg. Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Excise Commissioner in Mysore with enclosures.
The Comptroller, Mysore Government.
The Inam Superintendent.

Exd.—C. R.

1908-09

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL
(SEPARATE REVENUE)

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 23rd February 1909

No. Fl. 3771-3
S. R. 107-08-2

Recognising the Inamdar's claim to the Excise Revenue from toddy of the Sarvamanya Bagali, Jodi Jannur and Demahalli villages in the Chamrajnagar Taluk and the Sarvamanya Hoskote village in the Nanjangud Taluk.

GPB—20-3-09—200